DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 952 UD 025 560

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Home School and Adult Instruction Component, Home-School-Community Agents Project. Final Evaluation Report. Revised.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Antisocial Behavior; *Dropout Prevention; Family School Relationship; *High Risk Students; High Schools; Home Visits; Middle Schools; Potential Dropouts; Predictor Variables; Program Evaluation; *School Counseling; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; Disruptive Behavior; Dropout Prediction Scale

ABSTRACT

The Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project of the Columbus, Ohio Public Schools was successful in identifying disruptive pupils and helping them make some positive adjustment to those aspects of their lives that interfere with their success in school. Even though definitive gains in pupil attitudes fell slightly below the project goal, the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCA staff, and school staff involved in it. The project was implemented during the 1985-86 school year by 20 Home-School-Community-Agents who served in eight high schools and 12 middle schools. Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive and served as their liaison with the school. This evaluation of the HSCA Project used questionnaires to collect data on pupil attitude, elements obstructing achievement, pupil progress, pupils' perceptions of the Project, and school staff perceptions of the Project. Of these pupils, 108 (49.5%) demonstrated some positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. Two appendices to the evaluation provide the following: (1) a list of dropout probabilities by grade; and (2) survey instruments used for data collection. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282952

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

July, 1986

Written by:

Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of

John Duffy

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD025560

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary Thompson Ph.D.
Columbus Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT
1985-86

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The primary purpose of the Home-School-Community Agent (HSCA) Project is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process in or out of school.

Time Interval: The HSCA project started on August 27, 1985 and continued through the 1985-86 school year. Implementation of the project was accomplished by 20 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) who served in eight high schools and 12 middle schools.

Activities: Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Program Objective: Of the selected pupils served by the HSCA, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior and will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school. The HSCA will serve as a liaison to the home, school, and community to promote understanding and assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data using the Demos D Scale (provides a measure of pupil attitudes and the probability of dropping out of school), Pupil Entry Information Sheet (provides individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement), Pupil Census Form (provides pupil information and HSCA's ratings of pupil progress), Pupil Questionnaire (provides pupils' perceptions regarding the HSCA's activities), Professional Staff Survey (provides school staff perceptions regarding the role of the HSCA), and the HSCA Log Information (provides documentation of HSCA's activities).

Major Findings: Pretest-posttest Demos D Scales (DDS) were collected for 218 (54.5%) of the 400 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of the 218 pupils in the evaluation sample, 32 pupils (14.7%) had a lower probability of dropping out, and 25 pupils (11.5%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. Of these pupils 108 (49.5%) demonstrated some positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior.

Statistically significant improvement was indicated in grade 11 on the scale regarding attitude toward education, and on the scale regarding attitudes toward school behavior. Slight improvement in attitudes toward teachers was found in grades 6, 8, 10, and 11. Slight improvement in attitudes toward education was found in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12, and in the total across grades. Slight improvement regarding influence by peers or parents occurred in grades 6, 7, 10, and 11, and in the total across grades. Slight improvement of attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 6, 7, and 10. Slight improvements in terms of the total score occurred in grades 6, 10, and 11, and in the total across grades. According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on average, a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project.

A pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more reasons. Less than one-fourth of the students (22.2%) were referred for a single reason, and nearly one-fourth were referred for two reasons. Three or more reasons were given for referral for 53.8% of the pupils in the sample. Poor grades was the most frequently listed Referral Reason overall (43.5%), but was somewhat more frequent at middle school (49.6%) than at high school level (34.4%). Teacher conflict, which was the second most common Referral Reason overall (37.5%), also occurred more frequently at the middle school (40.4%) than at the high school level (33.1%). The most frequent Referral Reason at the high school level was peer conflict (36.2%), followed closely by poor grades (34.4%), class cutting (33.8%), teacher conflict (33.1%), and family/home problem (32.5%).

The HSCA's indicated that 66.8% of the evaluation sample showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons, that 63.5% showed academic improvement, and that 72.0% improved socially. Pupils reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (70.6%), families (37.1%), and friends (35.7%) since talking with the HSCA. Of the administrators and teachers who responded to the Professional Staff Survey, 77.0% reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance.

Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that the average HSCA's week included 35.9 contacts involving individual or group guidance for 12.1 hours; 31.9 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies; and 5.4 hours served in various school support activities. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicated that 95.6% of the respondents viewed the HSCA role of home-school-community liaison to be important.

The data collected for the Home-School-Community Agent Project indicated that the project was successful in helping disruptive pupils make some positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. Although definitive gains on an attitude test fall slightly below the project goal, the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCA's, and professional staff. A review of available attitude measures is recommended for comparison with the currently used Demos D Scale.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

July, 1986

Program Description

The Home-School-Community Agents project has been operating in the Columbus Public Schools since the 1968-69 school year. The overall goal is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process of the pupil in or out of the school.

To reach the 1985-86 project goal, 20 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) served 8 high schools and 12 middle schools. The schools are listed below:

High Schools	Middle Schools	
Briggs	Barrett	Indianola
Brookhaven	Beery	Linmoor
East	Crestview	Medina
Linden McKinley	Eastmoor	Mohawk
Marion Franklin	Everett	Starling
South	Hilltonia	Westmoor
West		
Whetstone		

Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1.0 Of the selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the treatment period, 50% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior.

Objective 2.0 At the culmination of the agent-pupil sessions, 50% of the selected pupils will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school.

Criterion 2.1 Identification of "disruptive" elements and/or pupil concern which appear to be obstructing pupil achievement.

Criterion 2.2 Evidence of positive adjustment of at least 50% of selected pupils.

Objective 3.0 To serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Criterion 3.1 80% of the pupils served will perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for the adjustment to the school environment.

Criterion 3.2 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA will perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance to pupils to the school environment.

Objective 4.0 To provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data in seven areas. Except for Demos D Scale a copy of each instrument used in the evaluation is found in Appendix B.

1. Pupil Attitude Information

The Demos D Scale (DDS; Demos, 1970) provides a measure of pupil attitudes and the probability of dropping out of school. The pretest was given in the period of October 23-31, 1985 and the posttest was given during the week of April 14-18, 1986.

The DDS is composed of 29 items that yield four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score. Pupils are asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale that, except for one item, ranges from "nearly always" to "nearly never". Higher scores indicate a poorer attitude and a higher probability of dropping out of school. The four Basic Area Scores and Total Score are as follows:

T (Teachers): Deals with attitudes toward teachers, counselors, and administrators. This area is comprised of 10 items with scores ranging from 10-50.

E (Education): Deals with attitudes toward education, training, and college. This area is comprised of nine items with scores ranging from 9-45.

P (Peers): Deals with attitudes toward peers and parents. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

S (School): Deals with attitudes toward school behavior. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

Total Score: The text publisher indicates that, based on the results of clinical experience, this is the best predictor of dropping out of school. Scores range from 29-145.

The test publisher cites the six uses for the DDS. First, it provides an objective method for obtaining expressions of attitudes related to dropping out of school. The DDS is of special help in working with junior and senior high school students. Second, it identifies students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school, so preventive or corrective work can take place while students still are in school. Third, the instrument can make it possible to alert parents of children who indicate that they may drop out of school. Fourth, data can be provided about students to facilitate the counseling or psychotherapy of problem children. Fifth, data can be used to structure or develop school programs for identifying and working with potential dropouts so schools can be of help in reducing dropouts. Sixth, the instrument can provide a research approach in areas such as dropping out of school, adjusting to school, attitude formation, effective learning, etc.

2. Pupil Entry Information

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet provided individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement which formed the basis for assigning pupils to the project. It also identified the person referring the pupil to the project. It was completed by the HSCA's, and collected in October, 1985.

3. Pupil Census Information

HSCA's completed a Pupil Census Form for each pupil in the evaluation sample. These forms were collected in April, 1986. Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on nine items: pupil involvement with the court, number of months in the project, number of contacts with the pupil, number of in-school conferences with the pupil, number of home visits made regarding the pupil, pupil referral to a community agency, and assessment of the pupils' adjustment in three areas: academic improvement, social progress, and final outcome regarding original referral reasons.

4. Pupil Questionnaire Information

The Pupil Questionnaire was used to survey pupils in the evaluation sample to determine their perceptions of the HSCA's role in providing adjustment to the home-school-community environment, and for evidence of pupils' adjustment to school. The instrument was administered in February, 1986.

5. Professional Staff Survey Information

The Professional Staff Questionnaire was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCA role as a liaison between the school and the home and community. It was administered in February, 1986, to those members of school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA Project, as determined from the Pupil Entry Information Sheet.

6. HSCA Log Information

The purpose of the HSCA Weekly Log Sheet was to provide documentation of a Home-School-Community Agent's activities in a selected week. The instrument was completed twice by each HSCA, once during the period of November 11 - December 20, 1985, and again in the period of February 10 - April 11, 1986. Specific weeks to be logged were assigned randomly.

7. Inservice Evaluation Information

The General Inservice Evaluation Form was used to document the number of inservice meetings held and obtain the ratings of HSCA's regarding the value of inservice that was provided. Ratings were obtained in the following areas: how worthwhile the meeting was, usefulness of the information presented, time available to ask questions, and how adequately questions were answered. The rating scale used was (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree. Dates and topics of HSCA inservice meetings were as follows:

Date	Topic
September 11, 1985	Programs of the Police Athletic League
October 17, 1985	Youth Gangs of Columbus
November 21, 1985	Youth Problems
April 17, 1986	Occupational Survey Testing

Inservice evaluation forms were completed for all the above meetings except the meeting of April 17.

Major Findings

The evaluation sample consisted of 400 pupils who were randomly selected from the 1,200 pupils served by the project. The grade and sex of sample pupils is presented in Table 1. The sample was comprised of 131 girls and 269 boys.

Table 1

Grade and Sex of Pupils
in the Evaluation Sample

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys
6	48	14	34
7	75	30	45
8	117	45	72
9	82	19	63
10	34	11	23
11	21	4	17
12	23	8	15
Total	400	131	269

Objective 1.0 required that 50% of the group of selected pupils who were served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period would show improvement in their attitude toward the school environment. The pupils were pretested during the period of October 23-31, 1985 and posttested during the week of April 14, 1986 with the Demos D Scale (DDS). The DDS yields four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score which provide data to be compared with the standardization group. The interpretation of DDS scores is as follows: the higher the score the greater the probability of dropping out of school. If it can be assumed that pupils with a high probability of dropping out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school behavior, a lower posttest score on the DDS should be one indication of a "positive" change in attitude.

Matched pretest-posttest DDS scores were collected for 218 (54.5%) of the 400 pupils in the evaluation sample. Of these pupils 108 (49.5%) demonstrated a positive change in their attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. Thus the Objective (1.0) of 50% was narrowly missed.

Table 2 contains descriptive data regarding the pretest-posttest DDS Basic Area Scores and Total Score reported by grade level. Improvement in attitudes toward teachers was found in grades 6, 8, 10, and 11. Improvement in attitude toward education was found in grades 6, 8, 10, 11, and 12, and in the total average across grades. Improvement in influence by peers and parents occurred in grades 6, 7, 10, and 11, and in the total average across grades. Improvement in attitudes toward school behavior occurred in grades 6, 7, 10, and 11. Improvement in terms of total score occurred in grades 6, 10, and 11, and in the total average across grades. Application of *t*-Tests indicated significant improvement in two subtests at grade 11. These were attitude toward education (significant at the .03 level), and attitude toward school behavior (significant at the .05 level). According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on average, a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project. The probabilities are expressed as the chance of dropping out per 100 pupils. The data in Figure 1 show that of the 218 pupils

Table 2

Pretest, Posttest and Change Means for DDS Basic Area Scores and Total Score Reported By Grade Level

Grade Level	Number of Pupils		T Attitudes Towards Teachers	E Attitudes Toward Education	P Influence by Peers and Parents	S Attitudes Toward School Behavior	Total Score
6	28	Pretest Mean	27.9	19.4	12.4	11.9	71.6
		Posttest Mean	26.3	17.4	12.2	11.5	67.3
		Change in Mean	- 1.6	- 2.0	- 0.2	- 0.4	- 4.3
7	43	Pretest Mean	27.2	17.5	12.3	11.4	68.4
		Posttest Mean	27.8	17.7	11.8	11.1	68.4
		Change in Mean	0.6	0.2	- 0.5	- 0.2	0.0
8	59	Pretest Mean	27.0	16.2	11.1	10.5	64.9
		Posttest Mean	26.9	16.2	11.3	11.1	65.4
		Change in Mean	- 0.1	- 0.1	0.2	0.6	0.6
9	44	Pretest Mean	24.7	16.8	10.9	11.1	63.5
		Posttest Mean	25.8	17.3	11.0	11.2	65.2
		Change in Mean	1.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	1.7
10	18	Pretest Mean	25.5	19.4	11.5	11.8	68.2
		Posttest Mean	25.2	17.2	10.7	11.2	64.3
		Change in Mean	- 0.3	- 2.2	- 0.8	- 0.6	- 3.9
11	11	Pretest Mean	26.3	18.9	10.0	11.4	66.5
		Posttest Mean	24.4	15.9	9.7	10.3	60.3
		Change in Mean	- 1.9	- 3.0	- 0.3	- 1.1	- 6.3
12	15	Pretest Mean	25.1	16.5	10.6	10.3	62.6
		Posttest Mean	25.5	15.9	11.5	11.1	64.0
		Change in Mean	0.4	- 0.7	0.9	0.7	1.4
Total	218	Pretest Mean	26.4	17.4	11.4	11.1	66.3
		Posttest Mean	26.4	16.9	11.4	11.1	65.8
		Change in Mean	0.0	- 0.5	- 0.1	0.0	- 0.6

Note. A negative change indicates improvement.

In some cases, the "Change in Mean" may appear to be a tenth of a point off from the apparent difference beteween pretest and posttest means. This is due to rounding error. All mean scores (pretest, posttest and change) were computed to four decimal places, but are rounded to the nearest tenth is this table.

in the evaluation sample, 32 pupils (14.7%) had a lower probability of dropping out, and 25 pupils (11.5%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. This same information is reported by grade level in Appendix A.

Objective 2.0 requires as a final outcome that 50% of the selected pupils demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives which interfere with their success in school. Criterion 2.1 requires the identification of those elements obstructing pupil achievement. The Pupil Entry Information Sheet is used to collect data on Criterion 2.1. Criterion 2.2 requires evidence of positive adjustment of at least 50% of the selected pupils. Data for Criterion 2.2, as well as additional data, are collected using the Pupil Census Forms.

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet provided data on who referred pupils and why they were referred to the HSCA. Table 3 contains a ranking of the frequency and percent by school level of the reasons that pupils were referred. The frequencies and percents in this table are not additive, since a pupil could be referred for more than one reason.

Poor grades appeared most frequently as a referral reason in middle school (49.6%), and also in the overall program (43.5%). Disruptive ranked second as a referral reason in middle school (41.2%), and third in the overall program (35.5%). Teacher conflict ranked third as a referral reason in middle school (40.4%), and second in the overall program (37.5%). In high school the most frequently cited referral reason was peer conflict (36.2%), followed closely by poor grades (34.4%), class cutting (33.8%), teacher conflict (33.1%), and family/home problem (32.5%).

As has been indicated, a pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more of the reasons indicated in Table 4. In Table 4, the number of reasons for which individual students were referred is summarized. Less than one-fourth of the students (22.2%) were referred for a single reason, and nearly one-fourth were referred for two reasons. Three or more referral reasons were given for 53.8% of the pupils in the sample.

The first criterion for Objective 2.0 was met. As indicated from the data above, the Pupil Entry Information Sheet served to identify the problem areas appearing to obstruct the achievement of individual pupils.

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.4
	50	0 0.0	1 0.5	153 70.2	18 8.3	2 0.9	174 79.8
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 6.4	3 1.4	2 0.9	19 8.7
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	11 5.0	6 2.8	5 2.3	22 10.1
	Total	0 0.0	1 0.5	181 83.0	27 12.4	9 4.1	218 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 1. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on Demos D Total Score Across Grades

Table 3

Frequency of Reasons for Referral to HSCA Program

Referral Reason	Total Component (Grades 6-12) N=400 Rank	Frequency	%	Middle School (Grades 6-8) n=240 Rank	Frequency	%	High School (Grades 9-12) n=160 Rank	Frequency	%
Poor Grades	1	174	43.5	1	119	49.6	2	55	34.4
Teacher Conflict	2	150	37.5	3	97	40.4	4	53	33.1
Disruptive	3	142	35.5	2	99	41.2	8	43	26.9
Peer Conflict	4	128	32.0	6	70	29.2	1	58	36.2
Poor Attitude	5	127	31.7	4	80	33.3	6	47	29.4
Family/Home Problem	6	112	28.0	7	60	25.0	5	52	32.5
Hostile to Authority	7	110	27.5	5	71	29.6	9	39	24.4
Attendance Problem	8	103	25.7	8	58	24.2	7	45	28.1
Truancy	9	76	19.0	9	48	20.0	10	28	17.5
Class Cutting	10	68	17.0	11	14	5.8	3	54	33.8
Law-Court Conflict	11	46	11.5	10	20	8.3	11	26	16.2
Drugs/Alcohol	12	26	6.5	12	11	4.6	13	15	9.4
Other	13	24	6.0	14.5	2	0.8	12	22	13.8
Health Problem	14	14	3.5	13	4	1.7	14	10	6.2
Reason not Specified	15	2	0.5	14.5	2	0.8	15	0	0.0

Table 4

Number of Reasons for which Students were Referred to the HSCA Program

Number of Reasons for Referral	Frequency	Percent
0	2	0.5
1	89	22.2
2	94	23.5
3	70	17.5
4	48	12.0
5	37	9.3
6	28	7.0
7	13	3.3
8	8	2.0
9	6	1.5
10	0	0.0
11	3	0.8
12	1	0.2
13	0	0.0
14	1	0.2
Total	400	100.0

The Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on pupil involvement with the court. Analysis of the Pupil Census Forms indicated that 147 (36.8%) of the 400 pupils in the sample had been involved with the court.

Table 5 presents the number of months pupils were served by the project. These data include any service received previous to the present school year. A majority of pupils in the evaluation sample (271) had been served by the project for 6 to 10 months. An additional 54 were served for 11 months or more. Thus, a considerable proportion of the pupils have been served by the project for one or more years.

Table 5

Number of Months Pupils Were Served
by the HSCA Project

Number of Months	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
1-5	75	18.8
6-10	271	67.8
11-15	22	5.5
16-20	30	7.5
21-25	1	0.3
More	1	0.3
Total	400	100.0

HSCA's were asked to indicate the number of contacts made with each pupil. Analysis of this data indicates that 66.5% of the pupils in the evaluation sample were seen seven or more times. The number of pupils who were seen eleven or more times was 160, or 40%. Therefore a large portion of the HSCA's time is spent in conferences. HSCA's indicated that four or more in-school conferences were held regarding 77.5% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. In addition, four or more home visits were made involving 29.3% of the pupils. The data relating to pupil contacts is contained in Table 6. An additional type of contact HSCA's made on behalf of pupils was referral to community agencies. HSCA's indicated that they had made such referrals for 51.8% of their pupils.

Table 6

Frequency of HSCA Contacts, In-school Conferences,
and Home Visits with Each Pupil

	Number of Contacts					
	None	1-3	4-6	7-10	11 or More	No Response
Contacts with the pupil	0	33	101	106	160	0
In school conferences held regarding this pupil	1	88	139	91	80	1
Home visits made regarding this pupil	59	224	91	18	8	0

HSCA's also rated each pupil's final outcome in relation to academic improvement, progress in social adjustment, and the original reasons for the pupil's referral. The following change categories were used: Marked Improvement, Improvement, or No Improvement. The final outcome ratings of the 400 pupils in the evaluation sample are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Number and Percent of
Pupils by Improvement Category

Change	Academic Improvement		Social Progress		Referral Reasons	
	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
Marked Improvement	56	14.0	61	15.3	66	16.5
Improvement	198	49.5	227	56.8	205	51.3
No Improvement	146	36.5	111	27.8	127	31.8
Not Answered	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3
Total	400	100.0	400	100.0	400	100.0

The second criterion of Objective 2.0 required evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the selected pupils. Table 7 shows that 271 (67.8%) of the pupils in the sample were rated as having derived some benefit ("Improvement" or "Marked Improvement") from the project in relation to their original Referral Reasons. In addition, 254 (63.5%) were rated as having improved academically, and 288 pupils (72.0%) were rated as having improved in their social progress. Both criteria for Objective 2.0 (identification of problem areas, and improvement in the problem areas) were met. Thus, Objective 2.0 was achieved. The numbers and percents of pupils rated in the highest category, "Marked Improvement," were 66 (16.5%) for Referral Reasons, 56 (14.0%) for academic improvement, and 61 (15.3%) for social progress. These are encouraging results for pupils who are in the project because of disruptive influences.

Objective 3.0 was to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. It had two criteria. Criterion 3.1 required that 80% of the pupils served would perceive that the HSCA provided such understanding and assistance; it was assessed using the Pupil Questionnaire. Criterion 3.2, which required similar perceptions by 80% of professional staff members who referred pupils to the HSCA, was assessed using the Professional Staff Survey. A third instrument, the HSCA Log Sheet, documented the weekly activities performed by the HSCA in attempting to meet the needs and goals of the pupils.

The pupils were surveyed during February, 1986 with the locally constructed Pupil Questionnaire. The Pupil Questionnaire was designed to determine student perceptions of the HSCA role in promoting adjustment in the home-school-community environment and to provide data regarding the student's adjustment to school.

Of the 285 Pupil Questionnaires that were distributed, 272 (95.4%) were returned. In the following analysis, all percents are based on the number of pupils returning the survey. The results of the survey are summarized in Tables 8-12.

Table 8

Activities to Help the Pupil
N=272

	Percent Responding
Which of the ways was used by the Home-School-Community Agent to help you.	Yes
Took time to discuss my problems with me	77.6
Visited my home	43.0
Arranged meeting(s) with teachers	38.2
Visited a community agent on my behalf such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency	12.9

Table 9

Promotion of Understanding by HSCA
As Perceived by Pupils
N=272

	Percent Responding		
Question	Yes	No	Partial Agreement
When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	94.9	4.4	0.7
The Home-School-Community Agent is understanding to talk to.	89.3	10.3	0.4
I think I understand my own problems better since talking with the Home-School-Community Agent.	82.4	16.5	1.1

Table 10

Perceptions Of The Helpfulness Of The HSCA
N=272

Question	Percent Responding Yes	No	Partial Agreement
The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me.	89.0	9.2	1.8
Pupils with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community-Agent.	94.5	5.1	0.4

Table 11

Pupil's Adjustment to School
N=272

Question	Percent Responding Yes	No	Partial Agreement
I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent	70.2	29.0	0.7
I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	76.5	21.7	1.8

Table 12

Getting Along Better With Others
N=272

Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with	Percent Responding Yes
My teachers	70.6
My family	37.1
My friends	35.7

When asked which activities HSCA's had performed in order to help them, pupils indicated the following: "Took time to discuss my problems with me" (77.6%); "Visited my home" (43.0%); "Arranged meeting with my teacher(s)" (38.2%); "Visited community agency on my behalf such as CMACAO, health center, or counseling agency" (12.9%) (see Table 8).

Data for survey items dealing with the promotion of understanding by the HSCA are presented in Table 9. When asked if it was a good idea to talk over their school-related problems with the HSCA, 94.9% of the pupils responded "yes". A large majority (89.3%) of the pupils also agreed that the HSCA was understanding to talk to. When the pupils were asked if they thought they understood their own problems better since talking with the HSCA, 82.4% indicated that this was the case.

The survey items in Table 10 indicate pupil perceptions of assistance (helpfulness) provided by the HSCA. The percent of pupils who perceived that the HSCA was helpful to them was 89.0%, and 94.5% of the pupils agreed that pupils with problems could get help from the HSCA.

Table 11 presents pupil's perceptions of their adjustment to school since their entry into the HSCA program. Improved classroom attendance was indicated by 70.2% of the pupils, and 76.5% of the pupils indicated improvement in keeping up with their assignments.

Additional evidence of pupil adjustment (to teachers, family, and friends) can be found in Table 12. Pupils indicated that, since talking to the Home-School-Community Agent, 70.6% were getting along better with their teachers, 37.1% were getting along better with their families, and 35.7% were getting along better with their friends.

Criterion 3.1 required that 80% of the pupils served would perceive the HSCA as promoting understanding and providing assistance for the adjustment to the school environment. The Pupil Questionnaire data cited above indicate that this criterion to objective 3.0 was attained. Well over 80% of the pupils perceived the HSCA as promoting understanding (see Table 9), and well over 80% also perceived the HSCA as providing assistance (see Table 10).

The professional staff members were surveyed in February, 1986 with the locally constructed Professional Staff Survey. The Professional Staff Survey was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCA's role as a liaison between the school and the home and the community. The surveys were sent to those members of the school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA program. A total of 172 Professional Staff Surveys were distributed. Of this number, 135 (78.5%) were returned.

Table 13 contains the percent of staff ratings on items regarding the value of HSCA services. To simplify the analysis the strongly agree and agree categories were combined. Analysis of the data indicated that 95.6% of the respondents considered the HSCA's role to be important, and 85.9% of the respondents viewed the HSCA as effective in the role of a liaison between the school, the home, and the community. The services

Table 13

Effectiveness of the HSCA Project
As Perceived by the Professional Staff
N=135

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
The Home-School-Community Agent's role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	77.0%	18.5%	3.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	65.2%	20.7%	12.6%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	60.0%	28.1%	7.4%	3.0%	0.7%	0.7%
The student(s) you referred to the Home-School Community Agent showed some improvement.	34.8%	42.2%	12.6%	6.7%	1.5%	2.2%
The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to the following areas:						
The school	51.9%	28.9%	11.1%	4.4%	1.5%	2.2%
The home	32.6%	24.4%	34.1%	3.7%	0.7%	4.4%
The community	27.4%	28.1%	35.6%	3.7%	0.7%	4.4%
The Home-School-Community Agent provides insights that are helpful toward positive adjustment of disruptive students to school.	56.3%	27.4%	8.1%	4.4%	0.0%	3.7%

of the HSCA to the total instructional effort of the school was considered valuable by 88.1% of the respondents.

A total of 77.0% of respondents reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. Members of the professional staff generally agreed that the services of the HSCA helped the pupils adjust to school, home, and community. Positive ratings were given by 80.7% of the respondents for adjustment to school, by 57.0% for adjustment to home, and 55.6% for adjustment to the community. Insights provided by the HSCA were also considered to be helpful toward positive pupil adjustment by 83.7% of the respondents.

Respondents also indicated to what extent the HSCA used various activities to help the pupils they had referred to the program (see Table 14). To simplify analysis the positive categories ("frequently" and "sometimes") were combined. The percent of respondents giving affirmative ratings was 90.4% for pupil conferences, 87.4% for conferences with the staff members who had referred pupils, 85.9% for home visits, 74.8% for pupil conferences in which parents or professional staff were also included, and 71.1% for enlisting help from community agencies. In addition, 51.1% indicated that the HSCA had appeared in court in regard to pupils. The high percentage of respondents that felt the HSCA used pupil conferences as a means of solving a pupil's problem is consistent with the data collected on the Pupil Survey and HSCA Log Sheets.

Criterion 3.2, that 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA would perceive the HSCA as promoting understanding and providing assistance to pupils, was attained. Substantially more than 80% of the respondents gave positive responses to items of the Professional Staff Survey directly related to this criterion (importance of HSCA role, effectiveness of HSCA as home-school-community liaison, importance of HSCA services to total instructional effort of the school, and insights or understandings).

The HSCA Log Sheet is an evaluation instrument which provides documentation of the activities of a HSCA during a selected week. Each HSCA was randomly assigned two separate weeks, once during the period from November 11 to December 20, 1985, and once during the period from February 10 to April 11, 1986, for which all activities were to be logged. Table 15 contains the average responses from the instrument, and indicates the extent of the various activities in the typical week of a HSCA during the time period sampled.

The HSCA's logged 15 job-related activities in the HSCA Weekly Log Sheet. These activities can be grouped into three roles: guidance, liaison, and school support. Guidance involves direct counseling with pupils individually or in small and large groups. The liaison role involves the HSCA intervening on behalf of the pupil with a third party. This party may be a parent, teacher, administrator, community agency or school psychologist. The last role, school support, involves those activities that support the overall success of the school program.

Examples might include telephone calls to homes, lunchroom duty, hall duty, general office work, transporting pupils, and staff meeting. The average HSCA week included 35.9 contacts involving individual or group guidance for a total of 12.1 hours, 31.9 liaison activities of various kinds, and 5.4 hours involving an average of 15.4 support activities. The documentation provided in the HSCA Log Sheet, along with data from the Pupil Questionnaire (Criterion 3.1) and the Professional Staff Survey (Criterion 3.2) give a clear indication that Objective 3.0 was achieved.

Table 14

Actions Taken by the HSCA
As Perceived by the Professional Staff
N=135

Item	Percent Responding					No Response
	Frequently	Sometimes	Undecided	Infrequently	Never	
Made home visits	57.8	28.1	5.9	2.2	0.7	5.2
Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	59.3	28.1	1.5	6.7	3.0	1.5
Had conferences with student(s) you referred	73.3	17.0	3.7	3.0	0.0	3.0
Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	45.9	28.9	8.1	7.4	5.2	4.4
Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, Etc.)	39.3	31.9	19.3	3.7	2.2	3.7
Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	30.4	20.7	25.2	4.4	13.3	5.9

Table 15

Weekly Averages of Activities Logged by the HSCA's on the HSCA Weekly Log Sheets

	Number of Sessions/ Contacts Per Week	Number of Students Per Session	Number of Minutes Per Session
Guidance			
Individual Conferences	26.5		18.0
Small Group Conferences	6.2	4.1	26.3
Large Group Conferences (Classroom Size)	1.6	24.4	37.3
Job Development and Career Education Instruction	1.6	1.7	15.3
Liaison			
Parent Conferences (in-school)	4.6		
Teacher/Staff Conferences	7.2		
Home/Visits	8.5		
Referrals to Community Agencies	4.2		
Follow-Ups of Referrals to Community Agencies	2.7		
Referrals to School Special Services Staff (Psychologists, Guidance Counselor, etc.)	3.0		
Follow-Ups to Special Staff	1.7		
Support Services			
Telephone	1.7		9.8
Transport Students	1.6	1.2	26.3
Monitor Halls/Lunchroom/ Grounds/School Vicinity	3.5		33.0
Misc.	8.7		17.5

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. There were four inservice meetings for HSCA's in the school year. The topics and dates of these meetings were as follows: Programs of the Police Athletic League, September 11, 1985; Youth Gangs of Columbus, October 17, 1985; Youth Problems, November 21, 1985; and Occupational Survey Testing, April 17, 1986. All except the last meeting were evaluated by the HSCA's, using the General Inservice Evaluation Form. In the first of these inservice meetings, all of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the meetings provided information that would assist them in their program. The percents of participants giving positive ratings to the other two evaluated meetings in regard to providing helpful information were 93.3% and 92.9%, respectively. The combined responses over the three evaluated sessions indicated that the meetings were judged by 95.7% of the participants to have provided information that would assist them in their program. The combined responses from the three evaluated meetings are summarized in Table 16. The rating scale key is: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree. Thus Objective 4.0 was achieved.

Table 16

Average Responses and Percent of Response
for Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	47	4.5	57.4	40.4	0.0	0.0	2.1
The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	47	4.4	46.8	48.9	2.1	0.0	2.1
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	47	4.6	61.7	36.2	0.0	0.0	2.1
Questions were answered adequately.	47	4.4	51.1	44.7	2.1	0.0	2.1

Additional information was collected on the General Inservice Evaluation Form using open-ended questions. Participants were asked to comment about the most and least valuable parts of the meetings, and about information they would like to have covered in future meetings. Only those open-ended comments which were made by three or more participants at any single session will be summarized here. However, the evaluation reports on individual sessions have been forwarded to the Department of State and Federal Programs and are available on request.

In regard to the most valuable parts of inservice meetings, the following items were notable from HSCA's comments: information on the Police Athletic League Program, information on youth gangs, and information on Youth Service Bureau Programs. In regard to least valuable parts of meetings, the only response with a frequency of three or more at any one session was that "none" or "nothing" was least valuable. There were no suggestions for future meetings having a frequency of three or more from any one inservice meeting.

Summary/Recommendations

The project had four objectives. The first objective stated that 50% of the selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period will show a more positive attitude toward teachers, education, and school behavior. The second objective states that at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements that interfered with their success in school. This objective required identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, and evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. The third objective was to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for pupil adjustment to the school environment. This objective required that both 80% of the pupils served and 80% of the professional staff members referring pupils to the program would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and assistance to pupils for adjustment to the school environment. It also required documentation of weekly activities of the HSCA in carrying out this objective. The fourth objective was to provide at least two inservice sessions to project personnel.

Objective 1.0 was narrowly missed. Slightly less than 50% of pupils (49.5%) showed improvement in their attitude as measured by the Total Score of the Demos D Scale (DDS). The average change score indicated a slight improvement in attitude. An examination of the pretest-posttest DDS data indicated that there was statistically significant improvement in grade 11 on the scale regarding attitude toward education and on the scale regarding attitudes toward school behavior.

The primary purpose of the DDS is to determine the probabilities of a pupil dropping out of school. The assumption is made that students who are likely to drop out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school. The test publisher states that the DDS may be used to identify students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school but cautions that DDS scores be used with all other available information concerning the student. It is not advisable that DDS scores by themselves be used for definitive diagnostic purposes.

The first criterion of Objective 2.0, identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, was evaluated on the basis of the Pupil Entry Information Sheet. The instrument provided individual pupil data which could be used by the HSCA, as well as for project evaluation. The five most frequent reasons for referral to the project were poor grades, teacher conflict, disruptive, peer conflict, and poor attitude. More than three-fourths (77.3%) of the pupils in the sample were referred for two or more reasons.

The second criterion of Objective 2.0, evidence of pupil adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils sampled, was primarily evaluated on the basis of individual data from the Pupil Census Forms. As rated by the HSCA's, 67.8% of pupils in the evaluation sample showed evidence of improvement in relation to their original referral reasons (51.3% showing "improvement," and 16.5% showing "marked improvement"). HSCA's also gave positive ratings to 63.5% of the pupils regarding academic improvement, and 72.0% of the pupils regarding social progress. Further verification of the attainment of this criterion was provided by the Pupil Questionnaire and the Professional Staff Questionnaire. Pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (70.6%), families (37.1%), and friends (35.7%) since talking with the HSCA. Of those who responded to the Professional Staff Questionnaire, 77.0% reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. The data indicated that both criteria for Objective 2.0 were met; thus Objective 2.0 was achieved.

The first criterion of Objective 3.0 was that 80% of the pupils served would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for their adjustment to the school environment. Analysis of the Pupil Questionnaire indicated that well over 80% of the pupils perceived the HSCA as promoting understanding, and well over 80% also perceived the HSCA as providing assistance. These data indicate that Criterion 3.1 was achieved. In addition, over 70% of the pupils perceived that they had actually improved in each of the following areas: classroom attendance, keeping up with assignments, and getting along better with teachers. Over 35% of the pupils also perceived that they were getting along better with family and with friends. In regard to specific activities most often performed by the HSCA on behalf of the pupils, 77.6% of the pupils reported HSCA-pupil conferences, 43.0% reported home visits, and 38.2% reported arrangement of conferences with their teachers.

The second criterion of Objective 3.0 was that 80% of the professional staff who referred pupils to the HSCA would perceive that the HSCA promoted understanding and provided assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. Analysis of the Professional Staff Survey indicated that 95.6% of the respondents viewed the HSCA's role of home-school-community liaison to be important, and 85.9% rated the HSCA as effective in providing the liaison services. Insights or understandings provided by the HSCA were also considered helpful toward positive pupil adjustment by 83.7% of the respondents. The data from the Professional Staff Survey indicates that this criterion of Objective 3.0 was met.

Objective 3.0 also required documentation of HSCA's weekly activities to meet the goals and needs of the pupils. Analysis of the HSCA Log Sheet indicated that an average HSCA's week included 35.9 contacts involving individual or group guidance for 12.1 hours; 31.9 liaison activities involving parents, school personnel, and/or community agencies; and 5.4 hours served in various school support activities.

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. Four inservice meetings were held during the 1985-86 school year. All but the last meeting were evaluated using the General Inservice Evaluation Form. Each of these was rated as providing information that would assist them in their project by more than 90% of the participants. The average percent of positive responses over the four evaluated meetings was 95.7%. Objective 4.0 was achieved.

The data collected for the 1985-86 Home-School-Community Agent project indicate that the project was successful in identifying disruptive pupils and helping them make some positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. Definitive gains in pupil attitudes, as measured by the Demos D Scale, fell slightly below the project goal. However, the project was considered valuable by pupils, HSCA's, and professional staff members involved in the project. Given the tenuous nature of attitude measurement, it is difficult to assess the degree to which change actually occurred. A review of available attitude measures is recommended for comparison with the currently used Demos D Scale.

References

Demos, G.D., The Demos D (Dropout) Scale. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services, 1980.

Appendix A

Dropout Probabilities by Grade

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 1.4
	50	0 0.0	1 0.5	153 70.2	18 8.3	2 0.9	174 79.8
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 6.4	3 1.4	2 0.9	19 8.7
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	11 5.0	6 2.8	5 2.3	22 10.1
	Total	0 0.0	1 0.5	181 83.0	27 12.4	9 4.1	218 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 1. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on Demos D Total Score Across Grades

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.6	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.6
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	16 57.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	16 57.1
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 7.1	1 3.6	2 7.1	5 17.9
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 14.3	2 7.1	0 0.0	6 21.4
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	23 82.1	3 10.7	2 7.1	28 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 2. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Six

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.3
	50	0 0.0	1 2.3	24 55.8	5 11.6	0 0.0	30 69.8
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 14.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 14.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 4.7	2 4.7	2 4.7	6 14.0
	Total	0 0.0	1 2.3	33 76.7	7 16.3	2 4.7	43 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 3. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Seven

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	46 78.0	7 11.9	1 1.7	54 91.5
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.7	2 3.4	0 0.0	3 5.1
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 3.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 3.4
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	49 83.1	9 15.3	1 1.7	59 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 4. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eight

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	32 72.7	5 11.4	1 2.3	38 86.4
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 4.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 4.5
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 4.5	1 2.5	1 2.5	4 9.1
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	36 81.8	6 13.6	2 4.5	44 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 5. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Nine

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 77.8	1 5.6	0 0.0	15 83.3
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.6	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.6
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 5.6	0 0.0	1 5.6	2 11.1
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	16 88.9	1 5.6	1 5.6	18 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 6. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Ten

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 90.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 90.9
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 9.1	0 0.0	1 9.1
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	10 90.9	1 9.1	0 0.0	11 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 7. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eleven

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.7
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	11 73.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	11 73.3
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 13.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 13.3
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.7	1 6.7
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 93.3	0 0.0	1 6.7	15 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 8. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Twelve

Appendix B

Instruments

Numbers in parenthesis are
for purposes of Data Processing

DPPF
HSCA
PUPIL ENTRY INFORMATION SHEET

PROGRAM 8 6 0 5 3 (1-5)
COST CENTER (6-8)
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER (9-17)

HSCA _____

School _____

Student Name First M.I. Last	Student Number (18-23)	Grade (24-25)	REFERRAL REASON(S) (39-52) Hostile to Auth. / Teacher Conflict / Law-Court Conflict / Class Cutting / Attendance Prob. / Truancy / Family/Home Prob. / Peer Conflict / Poor Grades / Poor Attitude / Drugs/Alcohol / Health Problem / Disruptive / Other (specify)	Name and Position of Referrer Position / Name

DFS 8/83

TEACHER NUMBER									PROGRAM CODE				
2	9	9	3	4	3	7	6	4	8	5	0	5	3

STUDENT						SCHOOL			GRADE		SEX
5	1	1	4	3	7	0	0	6	1	0	M

MALE ● FEMALE ○

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT			TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE			HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER WEEK			
1	2	3	4	5	6				

VCS Trans Copr 08 8153 32

41

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS - Columbus, Ohio — PUPIL CENSUS FORM

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	M.I.	SEX	TEACHER NUMBER
			M	299343764

SCHOOL		H.R.	GRADE	
	( ) 0127	10		10

USE A NUMBER 2 PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY WHEN MAKING CORRECTIONS.

1. HAS THIS PUPIL HAD ANY INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT?
   YES ○ NO ○

2. HOW MANY MONTHS HAS THIS PUPIL BEEN SERVED BY THE PROGRAM?
   1-5 ○ 6-10 ○ 11-15 ○ 16-20 ○ 21-25 ○ MORE ○

3. NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH THIS PUPIL?
   0 ○ 1-3 ○ 4-6 ○ 7-10 ○ 11 OR MORE ○

4. NUMBER OF IN-SCHOOL CONFERENCES HELD REGARDING THIS PUPIL?
   0 ○ 1-3 ○ 4-6 ○ 7-10 ○ 11 OR MORE ○

5. NUMBER OF HOME VISITS MADE REGARDING THIS PUPIL?
   0 ○ 1-3 ○ 4-6 ○ 7-10 ○ 11 OR MORE ○

6. DID YOU REFER THIS PUPIL TO A COMMUNITY AGENCY?
   YES ○ NO ○

7. WHAT IMPROVEMENT HAS PUPIL SHOWN ACADEMICALLY THIS YEAR?
   MARKED IMPROVEMENT ○ IMPROVEMENT ○ NO IMPROVEMENT ○

8. RATE PUPIL'S SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRESS THIS YEAR.
   MARKED IMPROVEMENT ○ IMPROVEMENT ○ NO IMPROVEMENT ○

9. FINAL OUTCOME - CONCERNING THE ORIGINAL REFERRAL REASON(S)?
   MARKED IMPROVEMENT ○ IMPROVEMENT ○ NO IMPROVEMENT ○

42

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROGRAM

You have met with Mr. Dickerson, the Home School Community Agent in your school, during this school year. The following questions give you a chance to express your feelings about how the Home-School-Community Agent has helped you. This is not a test. You do not have to give your name. When you are finished, fold your completed questionnaire and give it to a secretary in the school office, who will put it in the school mail. Thanks for your help.

Section I

Please circle all responses that apply to each statement.

1. Which of the ways was used by the Home-School-Community Agent to help you.
   A. Visited my home.
   B. Arranged a meeting(s) with my teacher(s).
   C. Took time to discuss my problems with me.
   D. Visited a community agency on my behalf, such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency.
2. Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with
   A. my teachers
   B. my family
   C. my friends

Section II

Please circle yes or no to each statement.

3.	When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
4.	The Home-School-Community Agent is understanding to talk to.	Yes	No
5.	I think I understand my own problems better since talking with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
6.	The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me.	Yes	No
7.	I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
8.	I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No
9.	Students with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No

DES 1/86

HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROJECT

PROFESSIONAL STAFF SURVEY

Please circle the number after each statement that shows how much you agree with each statement.

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Home-School-Community Agents role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The student(s) you referred to the Home-School-Community Agent showed some improvement.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustments in the following areas (please rate all three areas):					
a. The school	1	2	3	4	5
b. The home	1	2	3	4	5
c. The community	1	2	3	4	5
6. The Home-School-Community Agent provides insights that are helpful toward positive adjustment of disruptive students to school	1	2	3	4	5

In order to solve the problem(s) of student(s) you referred, the Home-School-Community Agent:

	Frequently	Sometimes	Undecided	Infrequently	Never
7. Made home visits:	1	2	3	4	5
8. Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	1	2	3	4	5
9. Had conferences with student(s) you referred	1	2	3	4	5
10. Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	1	2	3	4	5
11. Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, Etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
12. Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	1	2	3	4	5

DES 1/86

DPPF

Home-School-Community Agents
Weekly Log Sheet

Your week to be logged is _____.
Please return to Evaluation Services within two days.

School
Name

LABEL

Numbers in parentheses are for Data Processing purposes

(1-5) Program Code | 8 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
(6-8) Cost Center # | | | | |
(9-17) Social Security # | | | | | | | | | |

	Number of Sessions/ Contacts Per Week	Number of Students Per Session	Number of Minutes Per Session
Guidance, Home/School			
Individual Conferences	_____	_____	_____
Small Group Conferences	_____	_____	_____
Large Group Conferences (Classroom Size)	_____	_____	_____
Parent Conferences (in-school)	_____		_____
Teacher/Staff Conferences	_____		_____
Home/Visits	_____		_____
Referrals to Community Agencies	_____		_____
Follow-Ups of Referrals to Community Agencies	_____		_____
Referrals to School Special Services Staff (Psychologists, Guidance Counselor, etc.)	_____		_____
Follow-Ups to Special Staff			_____
Job Development and Career Education Instruction			
Other_____	_____	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____	_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM

Inservice Topic:_____

Presenter(s):_____

Date: _____ (e.g., 03/05/86)

Session: _____a.m. or _____p.m.

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
(4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
(5) CLEAR-Middle School-CAI

DPPF Programs:
(6) SDR (9-10)
(7) SDR-CAI
(8) HSCA
Other (Specify)_____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?_____

_____

_____